



Attorney Docket No. 5253.200-US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Blinkovsky *et al.*

Serial No.: 09/080,127

Filed: May 15, 1998

For: Polypeptides Having Aminopeptidase Activity And Nucleic Acids Encoding Same

Confirmation No.: 907

Group Art Unit: 1647

Examiner: S. Turner

PATENT

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

DEC 06 2002

RECEIVED

#28
B.Q.
12/18/02

AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

This is a response to the Advisory Action dated April 9, 2002. Claims 207-240 are pending in the present application. The Advisory Action of October 30, 2002, indicated that the proposed amendments of October 28, 2002, would not be entered because they raise new issues requiring further consideration. The present amendment is a duplication of the amendment of October 28, 2002.

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment presents no new issues or new matter and places this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is requested.

I. **Objections to Claim 202-205**

Claim 202 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.7 5(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claims 203-205 are also objected to as they depend from objected claim 202. The Office Action states:

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 202 depends from claim 190, 189 and 170 and shares all the characteristics thereof and therefore does not further limit as the polypeptide of claim 170 already requires the peptide to possess the characteristics recited.

Applicant has cancelled claim 202, but has corrected the dependency of the corresponding